

U.S. Application No. 09/994,659
Docket No. T36-137764M/AIO
(NGB.196)

2

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicant's representative would like to thank the Examiner for courtesies extended in the productive personal interview conducted on October 12, 2004.

An informal Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTOL-413) was provided by the Examiner at the interview. However, the formal "mailed" Interview Summary has not yet been received.

Applicant submits this Statement to comply with the requirements of M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

In the interview, the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 (which was entered in the record by the filing of a Request for Continued Examination) filed on August 6, 2004 was discussed, including the following:

A. Identification of claims discussed:

Generally, all claims (i.e., claims 1-28 and 35-39).

B. Identification of prior art discussed:

Generally, Kagami (JP 2000-347043).

C. Identification of principal proposed amendments:

None.

D. Brief Identification of principal arguments:

Applicants' arguments set forth in the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 filed on August 6, 2004 were discussed in detail.

U.S. Application No. 09/994,659
Docket No. T36-137764M/AIO
(NGB.196)

3

The Examiner kindly clarified his position on the issues presented in the final Office Action mailed February 6, 2004. Applicants' representative clarified Applicants' traversal positions set forth in the Amendment filed on August 6, 2004.

In the informal Interview Summary provided at the interview, the Examiner accurately summarized the discussions in the interview. The Interview Summary stated that:

The Applicant may wish to perfect priority to obviate the rejection based upon the Kagami JP reference. As it appears that the assignees were not the same at the time of invention, the application may not have a response under 103(c) to deal with the co-pending application, which is the US equivalent to the Kagami reference. To address the double patenting rejections, the application could file a terminal disclaimer if they were commonly owned (sic) when that terminal disclaimer was filed. The instant application on page 11 points to acrylates as radically polymerizable epoxies as cationically polymerizable (see Kagami example at [0034]). The applicant may wish to amend the claims to obviate the 102 issues by adding elements, such as particular monomers, use with particulate components (see claims 35-37), etc and coupling this with a declaration showing unobvious results. While it may be possible to polymerize epoxies through other mechanisms, cationic is by far the dominant mechanism for photocuring epoxies. With respect to the (meth)acryloyl radical(s), these are present only during irradiation and during the mixing of the resins (in claim 1) these transient (sic) species are not present. It may be that the acryloyl radical may be derived from acrylic acid monomers or acrylates, but the transient species are not monomers. The Applicant may wish to look into making this

U.S. Application No. 09/994,659
Docket No. T36-137764M/AIO
(NGB.196)

*application a continuation (sic) in part of the other, but time is of
the essence.*

(see Interview Summary at Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413).

E. Results of the Interview:

No agreement was reached in the interview.


The Examiner stated that the Amendment filed on August 6, 2004 would be considered in detail in view of the discussions conducted in the interview and that an Office Action after RCE would be issued shortly after the interview. Applicants note that a non-final Office Action mailed October 28, 2004 has now been issued.

F. Conclusion:

It is believed that no petition or fee is required. However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: November 19, 2004


John J. Dresch, Esq.
Registration No. 46,672

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386


McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

U.S. Application No. 09/994,659
Docket No. T36-137764M/AIO
(NGB.196)

5

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I certify that I transmitted via facsimile to (703) 872-9306 the enclosed Statement of Substance of Interview to Examiner Martin J. Angebrannt on November 19, 2004.


John J. Dresch, Esq.
Registration No. 46,672
Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.